

International Journal of Modern Physics A
 © World Scientific Publishing Company

Convolution formula and finite W boson width effects in top quark width

G. Calderón

*Facultad de Ingeniería Mecánica y Eléctrica, Universidad Autónoma de Coahuila, C.P. 27000,
 Torreón, Coahuila, México
 gecalde@gmail.com*

G. López Castro*

*Instituto de Física, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, A.P. 20-364, 04510 Mexico
 D.F., Mexico
 glopez@fis.cinvestav.mx*

Received Day Month Year

Revised Day Month Year

In the standard model, the top quark decay width Γ_t is computed from the exclusive $t \rightarrow bW$ decay. We argue in favor of using the three body decays $t \rightarrow bf_i\bar{f}_j$ to compute Γ_t as a sum over these exclusive modes. As dictated by the S-matrix theory, these three body decays of the top quark involve only asymptotic states and incorporate the width of the W boson resonance in a natural way. The convolution formula (CF) commonly used to include the finite width effects is found to be valid, in the general case, when the intermediate resonance couples to a conserved current (limit of massless fermions in the case of W bosons). The relation $\Gamma_t = \Gamma(t \rightarrow bW)$ is recovered by taking the limit of massless fermions followed by the W boson narrow width approximation. Although both calculations of Γ_t are different at the formal level, their results would differ only by tiny effects induced by light fermion masses and higher order radiative corrections.

Keywords: Top quark width; unstable particles.

PACS numbers: 11.10.St, 13.38.Be, 14.65.Ha, 14.70.Fm

1. Introduction

The precise calculation and measurement of the top quark decay width Γ_t is important to provide a consistency check of the Standard Model because Γ_t depends on the cubic of the top quark mass. Moreover, the large mass of the top quark implies a large decay width which in turn indicate that the top cannot be bounded to form hadrons^{1,2}. This feature makes attractive the application of perturbative methods to evaluate with high accuracy the quantum corrections to top quark decays.

*On leave absence from: Departamento de Física, Cinvestav, A.P. 14-740, 07000 México D.F., México

In particular, one expects that the top quark decay would provide the QCD analog of muon decay at the level of radiative corrections and that useful information about $\alpha_s(m_t)$ can be extracted. Therefore a precise definition of Γ_t incorporating all identified sources of corrections is necessary.

As is usually done, theoretical predictions have to match an accuracy comparable to or better than the experimental error bars. On the experimental side, the mass of the top quark m_t was expected to be measured with an uncertainty of up to 3 GeV in the Run II at the Tevatron Collider^{3,4,5}, but actually the experimental results have improved the expectations and we have, including new preliminary Run II results from CDF and D0, an uncertainty of 1.4 GeV (see Ref. 6), while Γ_t may reach a precision of 5–7% from the forward-backward asymmetry at planned linear colliders⁷. On the theoretical side, it is customary to compute the top quark width from the $t \rightarrow bW$ decay^a (see p. 517 in Ref. 8 and Refs. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14). This is called the narrow width approximation because the W boson is considered to be a stable on-shell particle. Different radiative corrections to this process have been reported within the Standard Model. The order α_s and α_s^2 QCD corrections to this rate turn out to be at the 10%^{9,10} and 1–2%^{11,12} level, respectively. On the other hand, the one loop electroweak corrections are found to affect the decay rate at the 1–2% level^{13,14}. Even some tiny effects in Γ_t of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$ arising from the renormalization of the V_{tb} matrix element, have been reported in the literature¹⁵. Finally, given the large mass of the top quark, virtual effects of hypothetical heavy particles might contribute to $\Gamma(t \rightarrow bW)$ at a few of percent level (see for example Ref. 16, ?).

Another important correction to be applied to Γ_t concerns the finite width effects of the W boson ($\Gamma_W \neq 0$). This was first considered in Ref. 9, 10 within the factorization approximation and using the convolution formula. In this paper we approach this problem by looking at the transition amplitude for $t \rightarrow b f_i f_j$ decays which considers the finite propagation of the unstable W boson and the finite fermion masses of its decay products. We also discuss the conditions that allows to derive the convolution formula to account for particle instability and we comment on possible departures from it when higher order corrections are considered. Such an approach was implicitly used in Ref. 18 where it was found that the finite propagation of an unstable W boson provides a source for the strong phase necessary to generate a non zero CP rate asymmetry in $t \rightarrow b\tau^\pm\nu_\tau$ decays. Clearly, this observable would not occur if the W boson is considered to be a stable particle.

Since the original submission of this paper, other works have appeared which considers the finite width effects in the observables associated to the production and decay of top quarks and massive gauge bosons at hadron and e^+e^- colliders^{19,20,21}. In the present version of our paper we focus on effects of instability of particles in the precision definition of their decay widths.

^aThe decay modes $t \rightarrow sW$, dW would be important only for a calculation aiming an accuracy below the 0.1% level.

2. Finite W boson width effects

As it was indicated above, most of the calculations of Γ_t (with the exception of Refs. 9, 10) assume that the W is a stable particle. The analysis of Refs. 9, 10 shows that the finite width of the W boson can induce an additional correction of $1 \sim 2\%$ to the $t \rightarrow bW$ decay rate. In practice, the W boson is not a real particle that can be reconstructed from their decay products with a well defined invariant mass m_W . Instead, the W boson is a resonance and it can not formally be considered as an asymptotic state to be used in the evaluation of S-matrix amplitudes. Furthermore, by cutting the production and decay mechanisms of a resonance can lead to miss important interference effects in the real observables which necessarily are related to the *detection* of (quasi)stable particles²².

For purposes of this paper we start by defining the top quark width by using the three body decays $t \rightarrow bf_i\bar{f}_j$ as follows

$$\Gamma_t \equiv \sum \Gamma(t \rightarrow bf_i\bar{f}_j) . \quad (1)$$

The sum is carried over flavors and colors of the fermion pair $f_i\bar{f}_j$ that are allowed by kinematics. Since the lifetimes of fermions in the final states are much larger than the typical interaction time scales (the W and t lifetimes), they can be considered as asymptotic states of this process. Note that if the production and decay of the intermediate W boson are considered as independent processes, the above formula can be approximated by

$$\Gamma_t \approx \Gamma(t \rightarrow bW) \times \sum_{i,j} \frac{\Gamma(W \rightarrow f_i\bar{f}_j)}{\Gamma_W} = \Gamma(t \rightarrow bW) , \quad (2)$$

which corresponds to the usual approximation.

We show in this paper that, in the limit of massless fermions, the tree level expression of Eq. (1) gives rise to a convolution formula commonly used (see for example Refs. 23, 24) to include the finite width effects of the W boson. Later, we let the W boson width to vanish and we show that the r.h.s of Eq. (1) reduces to $\Gamma(t \rightarrow bW)$.

Let us start our evaluation of the top decay width by computing the $t \rightarrow bf_i\bar{f}_j$ decay rate. The tree level amplitude for this process is given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{g}{2\sqrt{2}} V_{tb} \bar{u}(p_b) \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) u(p_t) (-iD_{\mu\nu}(Q)) \frac{g}{2\sqrt{2}} V_{ij}^* \bar{v}(p_j) \gamma^\nu (1 - \gamma_5) u(p_i) . \quad (3)$$

In this expression V_{kl} denote the corresponding Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix element associated to the kl fermionic current ($V_{ij} = 1$ for lepton doublets), g is the strength of the weak charged current and the momentum transfer is defined by $Q = p_t - p_b = p_i + p_j$. In the unitary gauge, the resonant W boson propagator $D_{\mu\nu}(Q)$ ^{25,26} can be divided into its spin-1 (transverse) and spin-0 (longitudinal) pieces according to

4 *G. Calderón and G. López Castro*

$$D_{\mu\nu}(Q) = \frac{g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{Q_\mu Q_\nu}{Q^2}}{Q^2 - m_W^2 + i\text{Im}\Pi_T(Q^2)} - \frac{Q_\mu Q_\nu}{Q^2} \frac{1}{m_W^2 - i\text{Im}\Pi_L(Q^2)} . \quad (4)$$

We consider m_W to be the renormalized mass of the W boson^b and we include only (finite) absorptive corrections to the W propagator as done in the context of the fermion loop scheme^{25,26,27,28}. In Eq. (4) we have defined $\text{Im}\Pi_T$ and $\text{Im}\Pi_L$ as the transverse and longitudinal projections of the W boson self energy, namely^{25,26}

$$\text{Im}\Pi^{\alpha\beta}(Q) = \left(g^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{Q^\alpha Q^\beta}{Q^2} \right) \text{Im}\Pi_T(Q^2) + \frac{Q^\alpha Q^\beta}{Q^2} \text{Im}\Pi_L(Q^2) . \quad (5)$$

Using cutting rules techniques, we can compute these absorptive parts of the W boson self energy. The expressions obtained at the lowest order in g are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}\Pi_T(Q^2) &= \sqrt{Q^2} \sum_{k,l} \Gamma^0(W(Q^2) \rightarrow f_k \bar{f}_l) \theta(Q^2 - (m_k + m_l)^2) \\ \text{Im}\Pi_L(Q^2) &= - \sum_{k,l} N_C \frac{g^2}{8} |V_{kl}|^2 \frac{Q^2}{4\pi} f(x_k^2, x_l^2) \lambda^{1/2}(1, x_k^2, x_l^2) \theta(Q^2 - (m_k + m_l)^2) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the sum extends over flavors ($k = u, c, e, \mu, \tau$; $l = s, d, b, \nu_e, \nu_\mu, \nu_\tau$) running in fermion loops for a W boson decay of squared momentum $\sqrt{Q^2} > m_k + m_l$. Let us emphasize that we have kept finite the masses of all fermions in these corrections in order to remain consistent when the masses of fermions in the final states of top decay are finite.

In the above expressions we have defined the (tree level) partial decay width of off shell W bosons as follows

$$\Gamma^0(W(Q^2) \rightarrow f_k \bar{f}_l) = N_C \left(\frac{g^2}{8} \right) \frac{|V_{kl}|^2}{12\pi} \sqrt{Q^2} [2 - f(x_k^2, x_l^2)] \lambda^{1/2}(1, x_k^2, x_l^2) , \quad (7)$$

where N_C is the number of colors, $x_i \equiv m_i/\sqrt{Q^2}$ and we have defined the functions: $f(r, s) \equiv r + s + (r - s)^2$ and $\lambda(a, b, c) \equiv a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - 2(ab + ac + bc)$.

As we mention in the introduction, the top quark decay width and their radiative corrections reported in the literature are usually calculated by using the two body $t \rightarrow bW$ process. If the W boson is off its mass shell, with a mass $\sqrt{Q^2}$, the decay width of the top quark becomes

^bSince we concentrate only on the imaginary parts of the $1PI$ corrections, the specific mass renormalization scheme is not of much relevance. However, this expression can be accommodated in the on-shell renormalization scheme.

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^0(t \rightarrow bW(Q^2)) \\ = \frac{G_F^0 m_t^3}{8\pi\sqrt{2}} |V_{tb}|^2 \frac{m_W^2}{Q^2} [(1-x^2)(1+2x^2) - y^2(2-x^2-y^2)] \lambda^{1/2}(1, x^2, y^2),\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

where $x \equiv \sqrt{Q^2}/m_t$ and $y \equiv m_b/m_t$. Note that we have replaced $g^2 \rightarrow 8G_F^0 m_W^2/\sqrt{2}$, where G_F^0 is the Fermi constant at the tree level.

A straightforward calculation of the top quark decay width using Eq. (1) leads to the following result

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_t^0 &= \sum_{i,j} \Gamma^0(t \rightarrow b f_i \bar{f}_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{i,j} \int_{(m_i+m_j)^2}^{(m_t-m_b)^2} dQ^2 \Gamma^0(t \rightarrow bW(Q^2)) \frac{\sqrt{Q^2} \Gamma^0(W(Q^2) \rightarrow f_i \bar{f}_j)}{(Q^2 - m_W^2)^2 + (Im\Pi_T(Q^2))^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{G_F^2 m_W^4 m_t^3}{64\pi^3} \sum_{i,j} |V_{tb} V_{ij}^*|^2 \int_{(m_i+m_j)^2}^{(m_t-m_b)^2} dQ^2 \lambda^{1/2}(1, x^2, y^2) \lambda^{1/2}(1, x_i^2, x_j^2) \\ &\quad \times [(1-y^2)^2 - x^2(1+y^2)] \frac{f(x_i^2, x_j^2)}{m_W^4 + (Im\Pi_L(Q^2))^2}.\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

The first term in Eq. (9) arises from the spin-1 degrees of freedom in the W boson propagator and the second one comes from its spin-0 component. The interference term in Eq. (9) vanishes due to the orthogonality of the amplitudes arising from the decomposition in Eqs. (3,4). Observe that the second term in the r.h.s of Eq. (9) vanishes in the limit of massless fermions ($f(x_i = 0, x_j = 0) = 0$); if we keep the finite masses of these fermions, the second term in Eq. (9) will give a negligible contribution ($\sim 2.7 \times 10^{-5}$ GeV) to Γ_t . The important point to stress here is that such corrections are very small because the intermediate W boson is coupled to an almost conserved vector current in the final state.

3. Narrow width approximation

Let us now consider the massless limit for fermions that participate in the W boson self energy correction and the decay of the W boson. In this case we have, from Eqs. (6), $Im\Pi_L(Q^2) = 0$ and

$$Im\Pi_T(Q^2) = \sum_{k,l} \sqrt{Q^2} \Gamma(W(Q^2) \rightarrow f_k \bar{f}_l) = \frac{Q^2}{m_W} \Gamma_W^0, \quad (10)$$

where $\Gamma_W^0 = \sum_{k,l} N_C g^2 m_W/48\pi$ is the on shell decay width of the W boson in the limit of massless fermions. Thus, in the limit of massless (light) fermions, Eq. (9) is

6 *G. Calderón and G. López Castro*

$$\Gamma_t^0 = \int_0^{(m_t - m_b)^2} dQ^2 \Gamma^0(t \rightarrow bW(Q^2)) \rho_W(Q^2) , \quad (11)$$

where

$$\rho_W(Q^2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\frac{Q^2}{m_W} \Gamma_W^0}{(Q^2 - m_W^2)^2 + \left(\frac{Q^2}{m_W} \Gamma_W^0 \right)^2} . \quad (12)$$

The convolution kernel $\rho_W(Q^2)$ in Eq. (11) coincides with the one used in Refs. 23, 24 to include the finite width effects of gauge bosons in final states. The factor Q^2 in the numerator of the convolution kernel serves to cancel the Q^2 factor appearing in the denominator of the $t \rightarrow bW(Q^2)$ decay rate -see Eq. (8)- and avoids that the integrand in Eq. (11) diverges in the limit $Q^2 \rightarrow 0$. This result is consistent with the fact that in the limit $Q^2 \rightarrow 0$, the W boson produced in the $t \rightarrow bW(Q^2)$ decay has only two degrees of freedom and some care must be taking when using Eq. (8) in that limit. On the other hand, Eq. (11) (and, as a matter of fact, the results of Refs. 23, 24) can be viewed as a factorization of the production and decay subprocesses of the W gauge-boson. As already explained, this approximation (which can be justified on probabilistic grounds when the production and decay mechanisms of the W boson are independent) can be valid only in the limit of massless fermions.

Next we focus in the narrow W boson width approximation. In the limit $\Gamma_W^0 \rightarrow 0$, Eq. (11) reduces to

$$\Gamma_t^0 \rightarrow \int dQ^2 \Gamma^0(t \rightarrow bW(Q^2)) \delta(Q^2 - m_W^2) = \Gamma^0(t \rightarrow bW) . \quad (13)$$

Thus, we consistently recover the tree level decay rate of two body decay, Eq. (8), which is used as the starting point to implement the radiative corrections to Γ_t in other calculations^{9,10–16,17}.

One may wonder also which are the possible effects of considering the finite width of the top quark on its $t \rightarrow bW$ decay width. This question may be of relevance in the case that the top quark width is not extracted from a Breit-Wigner invariant mass distribution, as commonly done with other resonance parameters. An estimate of such effects can be done by using similar arguments as above, namely

$$\Gamma_t^{smear} = \int_{(m_t - \Delta)^2}^{(m_t + \Delta)^2} dQ'^2 \Gamma^0(t(Q'^2) \rightarrow bW) \rho_t(Q'^2) , \quad (14)$$

with a definition of $\rho_t(Q'^2)$ similar to Eq. (12), with (m_W, Γ_W) replaced by (m_t, Γ_t) . If we choose $m_t = 174.2$ GeV, $m_W = 80.403$ GeV⁸ and $\Delta = 20\Gamma_t^0(t \rightarrow bW)$, where $\Gamma_t^0(t \rightarrow bW)$ is given by Eq. (8) when $Q^2 = m_W^2$, we get

$$\frac{\Gamma_t^{smear}}{\Gamma_t^0(t \rightarrow bW)} \approx 0.989, \quad (15)$$

namely it reduces the top quark decay width by 1.1%. We note that this effect is sensitive to the specific value used for Δ .

To end this section, we provide the values of the top quark decay width that are calculated using the different approximations. For comparative purposes we normalize the different results to $\Gamma_t^0(t \rightarrow bW)$. Thus, we get

$$\frac{\Gamma_t}{\Gamma_t^0(t \rightarrow bW)} = \begin{cases} 0.98508, & \text{using Eq. (9)} \\ 0.98509, & \text{using Eqs. (11-12)} \end{cases}. \quad (16)$$

We observe that the effect of finite W boson width is about 1.5%. Also, a comparison of the two numbers given above shows that finite fermion mass effects are negligible, of order 1×10^{-5} , and that the CF of Eqs. (11-12) gives an excellent approximation. In the above calculations we use the CKM parameters expressed in terms of the Wolfenstein parameters, whose central values we take $\lambda = 0.2272$, $A = 0.818$, $\bar{\rho} = 0.221$ and $\bar{\eta} = 0.340$ ⁸. We use for the Fermi coupling constant the value $G_F = 1.16637 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ and for the CKM matrix element $V_{tb} = 1$. For the lepton and quark masses we use values quoted in Ref. 8.

4. Departures from the convolution formula: an example

We mention above that departures from the convolution formula (CF), Eq. (11), are expected when the intermediate resonance is not coupled to a conserved current. In the example considered above, the W boson couples to a quasi conserved current, although the effects of finite fermion masses are very small. In this section we consider another example where departures from the CF arising from a quasi conserved current can be more sizable.

Let us consider the decay $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu_\tau V^{*-}(Q^2) \rightarrow \nu_\tau P_1 P_2$, where $P_1 P_2 = \pi^- \pi^0$ ($K\pi$) are pseudoscalar mesons and $V^{*-} = \rho^-(K^{*-})$ denotes an intermediate vector meson. We choose the following propagator for the intermediate virtual meson²⁹

$$D_V^{\mu\nu}(Q^2) = \frac{g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{Q^\mu Q^\nu}{M_V^2 - i\sqrt{Q^2}\Gamma_V(Q^2)}}{Q^2 - M_V^2 + i\sqrt{Q^2}\Gamma_V(Q^2)}, \quad (17)$$

where $\Gamma_V(Q^2)$ denotes the energy dependent width of the vector meson and M_V its mass. As in the previous example, we decompose $D_V^{\mu\nu}(Q^2)$ into their transverse (T) and longitudinal (L) pieces; thus we get the following expression for the decay rate

$$\Gamma(\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau P_1 P_2) = \Gamma_T + \Gamma_L, \quad (18)$$

8 *G. Calderón and G. López Castro*

where ($q = d$ or s)

$$\Gamma_T = \int_{(m_1+m_2)^2}^{m_\tau^2} dQ^2 \frac{\sqrt{Q^2} \Gamma(\tau \rightarrow V(Q^2) \nu_\tau) \cdot \Gamma(V(Q^2) \rightarrow P_1 P_2)}{(Q^2 - M_V^2)^2 + Q^2 \Gamma_V^2(Q^2)} \quad (19)$$

$$\Gamma_L = \frac{G_F^2 |V_{uq}|^2 g_V^2 g_{V P_1 P_2}^2}{256 \pi^3 m_\tau} \int_{(m_1+m_2)^2}^{m_\tau^2} \frac{dQ^2}{Q^6} \frac{(m_\tau^2 - Q^2)^2 (m_1^2 - m_2^2)^2 \lambda^{1/2}(Q^2, m_1^2, m_2^2)}{M_V^4 + Q^2 \Gamma_V^2(Q^2)} \quad (20)$$

In the above expression g_V ($g_{V P_1 P_2}$) denote the weak (strong) couplings of the intermediate vector meson, and we have defined

$$\Gamma(\tau \rightarrow V(Q^2) \nu_\tau) = \frac{G_F^2 |V_{uq}|^2 g_V^2}{16 \pi m_\tau^3} \cdot \frac{(m_\tau^2 - Q^2)^2 (m_\tau^2 + 2Q^2)}{Q^2} \quad (21)$$

$$\Gamma(V(Q^2) \rightarrow P_1 P_2) = \frac{g_{V P_1 P_2}^2}{48 \pi} \cdot \frac{\lambda^{3/2}(Q^2, m_1^2, m_2^2)}{(Q^2)^{5/2}}. \quad (22)$$

Using the values $g_{\rho^- \pi^- \pi^0} = 5.959$ and $\sqrt{2} |g_{K^{*-} K^- \pi^0}| = |g_{K^{*-} \bar{K}^0 \pi^-}| = 4.575$, we get (note that the values of g_V , G_F and $|V_{ij}|$ cancels in the ratio)

$$\frac{\Gamma_T(\tau^- \rightarrow P_1 P_2 \nu_\tau)}{\Gamma(\tau^- \rightarrow V^- \nu_\tau)} = \begin{cases} 0.8615 & \text{for } \pi^- \pi^0 \\ 0.9263 & \text{for } K\pi \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_L(\tau^- \rightarrow P_1 P_2 \nu_\tau)}{\Gamma(\tau^- \rightarrow V^- \nu_\tau)} = \begin{cases} 4.44 \times 10^{-6} & \text{for } \pi^- \pi^0 \\ 8.50 \times 10^{-3} & \text{for } K\pi \end{cases}, \quad (24)$$

where $\Gamma(\tau^- \rightarrow V^- \nu_\tau)$ denotes the decay rate of Eq. (21) taken at $Q^2 = M_V^2$ and $K\pi$ denotes the sum of $K^- \pi^0$ and $\bar{K}^0 \pi^-$ channels. Thus, we observe that departures from the CF induced by the non conservation of the weak current in the hadronic vertex are small, and the most important effect (of $\mathcal{O}(1\%)$) corresponds to the $K\pi$ channel (SU(3) breaking in $K\pi$ vs. SU(2) breaking in $\pi\pi$). Also, we note that the finite width effects are more important as the intermediate resonance is broader.

5. Conclusions

In summary, the purpose of this paper is to point out that the top quark decay width must be evaluated from its three body decays ($t \rightarrow b f_i \bar{f}_j$) instead of using the decay $t \rightarrow b W$. The former modes involve only final state particles that can be considered as asymptotic states required to correctly define S-matrix amplitudes. On the other hand, the three body decay amplitudes incorporate the finite width effects of the W boson in a natural way.

We find that the convolution formula (CF) commonly used to incorporate the finite width effects is valid when the intermediate W boson is coupled to a conserved current (the spin-0 component of the W boson propagator decouples in the limit of massless fermions). Clearly, the CF gives an excellent approximation to incorporate finite width effects in the top quark decay width at the tree level but it can not be

the case in general. As an example we have considered $\tau^- \rightarrow P_1 P_2 \nu_\tau$ decays where signal departures from the CF at the level of 1% can be obtained.

As we pointed out before, the non conservation of the weak charged current signal departures from the exact convolution formula for the top quark decay width. Note also that higher order corrections can also break the validity of the exact convolution formula. In particular, the box diagram electroweak corrections which connects the $t\bar{b}$ to the $f_i \bar{f}_j$ external lines does not allow for a unique transverse plus longitudinal decomposition of the intermediate state (WZ , $W\gamma$) that connects these currents. Thus, additional contributions to the CF can be expected in the presence of higher order corrections. Note however that the one loop QCD corrections to $t \rightarrow b f_i \bar{f}_j$ will not affect the convolution formula (Eq. (11)) as long as the QCD box corrections and the tree level amplitudes do not interfere at this order^{30,31}.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to J. Pestieau, F. J. Ynduráin and C. P. Yuan for useful comments. This work has been partially supported by Conacyt (México).

References

1. I. I. Y. Bigi, Y. L. Dokshitzer, V. A. Khoze, J. H. Kuhn and P. M. Zerwas, Phys. Lett. B **181**, 157 (1986).
2. L. H. Orr, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 88 (1991).
3. S. Willenbrock, Rev. Mod. Phys. **72**, 1141 (2000).
4. P. C. Bhat, H. B. Prosper and S. S. Snyder, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **13**, 5113 (1998).
5. M. Beneke *et al.*, arXiv:hep-ph/0003033.
6. See <http://tevewwg.fnal.gov/top/>.
7. K. Fujii, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. B **59**, 331 (1997).
8. W. M. Yao *et al.* [Particle Data Group], J. Phys. G **33**, 1 (2006).
9. M. Jezabek and J. H. Kühn, Nucl. Phys. B **314**, 1 (1989).
10. M. Jezabek and J. H. Kühn, Phys. Rev. D **48**, R1910 (1993).
11. A. Czarnecki and K. Melnikov, Nucl. Phys. B **544**, 520 (1999).
12. K. G. Chetyrkin, R. Harlander, T. Seidensticker and M. Steinhauser, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 114015 (1999).
13. A. Denner and T. Sack, Nucl. Phys. B **358**, 46 (1991).
14. G. Eilam, R. R. Mendel, R. Migneron and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 3105 (1991).
15. S. M. Oliveira, L. Bruecher, R. Santos and A. Barroso, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 017301 (2001).
16. B. Grzadkowski and W. Hollik, Nucl. Phys. B **384**, 101 (1992).
17. A. Denner and A. Hoang, Nucl. Phys. B **397**, 483 (1993).
18. D. Atwood, G. Eilam, A. Soni, R. R. Mendel and R. Migneron, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1364 (1993).
19. W. Bernreuther, A. Brandenburg, Z. G. Si and P. Uwer, Nucl. Phys. B **690**, 81 (2004).
20. A. Brandenburg, Z. G. Si and P. Uwer, Phys. Lett. B **539**, 235 (2002).
21. S. Dittmaier and M. Roth, Nucl. Phys. B **642**, 307 (2002).
22. See for example: N. Kauer and D. Zeppenfeld, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 014021 (2002).
23. T. Muta, R. Najima and S. Wakaizumi, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **1**, 203 (1986).
24. G. Altarelli, L. Conti and V. Lubicz, Phys. Lett. B **502**, 125 (2001).

10 *G. Calderón and G. López Castro*

25. M. Beuthe, R. González Felipe, G. López Castro and J. Pestieau, Nucl. Phys. B **498**, 55 (1997).
26. D. Atwood, G. Eilam, R. Mendel, R. Migneron and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 289 (1994).
27. E. N. Argyres *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **358**, 339 (1995).
28. U. Baur and D. Zeppenfeld, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1002 (1995).
29. G. López Castro and G. Toledo Sanchez, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 033007 (2000).
30. Private communications with F. J. Ynduráin and C. P. Yuan.
31. M. C. Smith and S. Willenbrock, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 6696 (1996)